

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 16-18, 20, 21, 23-26, 29, 30, 32, 33, 37, and 44 are pending in the current application. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 16-18, 20, 21, 23-26, 29, 30, 32, 33, 37, and 44 currently stand rejected, and claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 16, 18, 20, 21, 37, and 44 have been amended. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 16-18, 20, 21, 23-26, 29, 30, 32, 33, 37, and 44 are respectfully requested in light of the preceding amendments and following remarks.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for her time and consideration during the telephonic interview of September 2, 2010. During the interview, the parties discussed the applied references Kato and Hirayama and a proposed amendment to overcome the current rejections. The parties agreed that an amendment to each independent claim clarifying “the playitem identifying a same playing interval in each clip file of the plurality of clip files associated with the multiple playback paths” would require further search and consideration. Applicants have amended the claims in accordance with this agreement and offer further comments below as to how the claims as amended are allowable over the art of record.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 16-18, 20, 21, 23-26, 29, 30, 32, 33, 37, and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat 5,884,004 to Sato et al. (“Sato”) in view of US Pat Pub 2002/0145702 to Kato et al. (“Kato”) and US Pat 5,819,003 to Hirayama et al (“Hirayama”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons detailed below.

With regard to claim 1, Applicants initially note that the claim has been amended to clarify the “the playitem identifying a **same playing interval in each clip file of the plurality of clip files** associated with the multiple playback paths.” That is, the playitem identifies a same in-time and out-time that is applicable to each interchangeable playback path (angle), such that any path will require the same reproduction time and may be interchanged without upsetting program length or scene link points. The Examiner applies Kato, FIG. 25, having PlayList that identifies an individual playitems, which point to clips to be played back. Applicants respectfully submit that, even if playitems identify a clip in Kato, this **does not teach or suggest identifying several clips, identifying a playing interval in a clip, or identifying an identical playing interval among several clips.** See, Kato, ¶ [0255]. At best, Kato discloses only a total replay time of all PlayItems in a Playlist. See, Kato, ¶ [0259]. As such, where Kato lacks the recited playitem identifying equal playing intervals in several clips of claim 1.

With further regard to claim 1, The Examiner alleges that a “map identifying at least one entry point for the associated clip file by identifying the

packet number of the data packet of the at least one entry point" is met by FIGS. 8A-8C of Hirayama. Applicants respectfully submit that FIGS. 8A-8C show an ordering of program bars, and **a total time required to fully reproduce each bar**. See Hirayama Col. 8, ll. 50-67 (program bars last X minutes and Y seconds – PTMB indicates time period to reproduce all data units in a program bar). This playing time does not indicate and individual data unit number or correlate specific times with individual units, so that one could calculate at what time each unit was to be reproduced. It is just an amount of time required to reproduce all data units in a certain program bar. As such, Hirayama lacks the recited map that identifies packet numbers for each clip file entry point.

Sato and Hirayama do not cure the differences between claim 1 and Kato, discussed above. Because Kato, alone or in combination with Hirayama and Sato, fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1, these references cannot anticipate or render obvious claim 1. Similarly, claims 16 and 18-21 recite the same unique features of claim 1 discussed above and are thus allowable over Sato, Kato, and Hirayama at least for reciting these features. Claims 2, 6, 7, 9, 17, 23-26, 29, 30, 32, 33, 37, and 44 are allowable at least for depending from an allowable base claim. Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 16-18, 20, 21, 23-26, 29, 30, 32, 33, 37, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 16-18, 20, 21, 23-26, 29, 30, 32, 33, 37, and 44 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By



Ryan E. Alley, Reg. No. 60,977
Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

GDY/REA
995302.1